DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 104 213 HE 006 334

TITLE	Report of the Committee to Study Higher Education in the Baltimore Metropolitan Region.
INSTITUTION	Maryland Council for Higher Education, Annapolis.
PUB DATE	Dec 74
NOTE	37p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	Community Colleges; Degrees (Titles); Educational Programs; *Enrollment Projections; Facilities; Faculty; *Higher Education; *Institutional Role; *Interinstitutional Cooperation; State Colleges; State Universities; *Statewide Planning; Students
IDENTIFIERS	*Baltimore; Maryland

ABSTRACT

The Committee to Study Higher Education in the Baltimore Metropolitan Region was appointed to examine higher educational activities in the region, to determine the present availability of program offerings among the institutions, the enrollment patterns of the institutions, the future plans of the institutions, and to make recommendations. The committee examined data on students, programs, degrees, faculty, and facilities for all the institutions in the area. Recommendations of the committee include: (1) The Maryland Council for Higher Education should be given the accreditation function of the postsecondary institutions of higher education, (2) All institutions should be required to submit to the Maryland Council a clear statement of the mission of the institution and a listing in order of priority of the current and future activities of the institutions. (3) No new academic program duplication should be permitted among the institutions in the region. (4) Full-time enrollment ceilings should be imposed on the 4-year public institutions in the region. (5) Morgan State College should be deveolped into a state university. (6) The state should provide access for qualified students of all races to doctoral degree programs available in the state. (7) A common catalogue should be developed for all the state institutions and be disseminated to students and the public. (Author/PG)

ED104213

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

MARYLAND COUNCIL FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE TO STUDY HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE BALTIMORE METROPOLITAN REGION

COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

Mr. Philip Pear, Chairman
Mr. Harry K. Wells
Dr. Henry C. Welcome

HE 006 334

December 1974

William P. Chaffinch
Chairman
Harry K. Wells
Vice-Chairman
Mrs. Gertrude H. Crist
Secretary
Mrs. Thelma B. Cox
Mrs. Marilyn R. Goldwater
Dr. R. Lee Hornbake
Don R. Kendall
Edmund C. Mester
Philip Pear
Joseph A. Sellinger, S.J.
Jack F. Tolbert
Dr. Henry C. Welcome
Ellery B. Woodworth

STATE OF MARYLAND

MARYLAND COUNCIL FOR HIGHER EDUCATION
The State Postsecondary Education Commission
Under P. L. 92-318
93 MAIN STREET - ANNAPOLIS 21401

301-267-5961

Dr. Wesley N. Dorn
Executive Director
Dr. Joseph F. Keimig
Associate Executive Director
Dr. Sheldon H. Knorr
Assistant Executive Director

December 2, 1974

Mr. William P. Chaffinch
Chairman
Maryland Council for Higher Education
93 Main Street
Annapolis, Maryland 21401

Dear Mr. Chaffinch:

As chairman of the Committee to study Higher Education in the Baltimore region, I am respectfully submitting its report to the Maryland Council for Higher Education.

Over the past four months we have been engaged in an extensive review of higher education in the metropolitan Baltimore area. Specifically, we have interviewed and met with the presidents of all of the public segments of higher education, i.e., the Community Colleges, the State Colleges and the University of Maryland Baltimore County.

Though metropolitan Baltimore was examined as an entity, it is to be noted that each of the segments is not directly integrated into this geographic area, but is rather governed by a Board as part of the statewide system. This, at times, has contributed to a lack of coordination among the various segments.

In view of the substantial black population concentration in the city of Baltimore and the white concentration in suburban Baltimore, there has been created a dichotomy preventing the ultimate integration and coordination of higher education in the metropolitan Baltimore area.

The Supreme Court decision has required desegregation in the various components of higher education. This has not been carried to its fruition, since in many instances the black population has felt that its aspirations and needs have not been fulfilled by observing the desegregation order.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Complicating this entire problem is the fact that there is a leveling off of total enrollment and a constant competition by the various institutions for funds so that they may fulfill what they believe to be their effective mission. It must be recognized that the future does not bode well for the possibility of substantial additional funds since the mere requirement to keep pace with inflation has made new funding very difficult.

Underlying this complicated situation is a feeling on the part of the layman that in many instances higher education is not fulfilling its role. We have, in effect, in many instances a disenchanted citizenry observing the various segments of higher education operating as though the public segment has within it very little responsibility for coordination and selectivity as to funds and utilization of its facilities.

In conclusion I think it is imperative that we avoid an educational situation as described by Father John Finley, S.J., President of Fordham University, who said: "It is my personal conviction that American education has been crippled internally and discredited externally by its growing reluctance to pass qualitative judgments on academic performance and by the embarrassed silence that settleds over a discussion when a personal moral issue is raised. How often is right and wrong reduced to the level of taste or an interesting statistic? We underestimate the degree to which universities are regarded as a moral force in society as well as an intellectual resource".

I trust the accompanying report, if implemented, will give some guidance as to the resolution of the problem.

Yours very truly,

Philip Pear, Chairman
Committee to Study Higher Education
in the Baltimore Metropolitan Region

Dr. Henry Welcome - Member
Harry K. Wells - Member

PP:p:vt

The Committee to Study Higher Education in the Baltimore Metropolitan Region was appointed by the Maryland Council for Higher Education in September 1974 with the charge to examine higher education activities in the region to determine the present availability of program offerings among the institutions, the enrollment patterns of the institutions, the future plans of the institutions, and to make recommendations which will:

(1) Provide for a high quality level of program offerings in the institutions.

(2) Provide for maximum use of existing educational resources in the area.

(3) Minimize unnecessary duplication of program offerings among institutions in the quest for efficiency of operation.

(4) Provide for equal student access to higher education particularly without regard to race.

(5) Suggest future directions for development of higher education, not presently available, which will service the needs of the Baltimore Metropolitan Region.

Committee Procedures

The Committee examined data on students, programs, degrees, faculty, and facilities for all the institutions in the area (a portion of the data examined are included in the Appendix). Projections for student enrollments and facility requirements were examined in detail. It was determined that substantial future higher education growth in the area will likely be limited to the public institutions. The proprietary institutions at this point in time are being recognized as a potential major contributor to providing postsecondary education to the students in the region, but no information is currently available on plans for new institutions; consideration, therefore, could not be given these institutions in this study. The Council, however, must address proprietary education in the

future as a result of its new role as the Postsecondary Education Planning Commission for the State of Maryland.

The Committee met with each of the presidents of the public four year and two year colleges in the region. Each president was asked to make a presentation before the Committee addressing three general questions:

(1) What, if any, problems do you perceive as existing in the relationships of the institutions of higher education in the region?

(2) What are the advantages and disadvantages as you perceive them regarding the possible creation of a State University of the Baltimore-Metropolitan area?

(3) What do you feel would be logical changes in the area regarding institutional structures and/or missions?

Each president, in addition to making a written and verbal presentation, spent approximately half of their allotted time discussing higher education issues with the Committee. Prior to each visit before the Committee, the college president met with the Committee staff to discuss the nature of their presentation.

Problems

The Committee identified the following set of problems:

(1) There appears to be very little assessment of the quality of the institutions going on at the present time with respect to offerings and outputs. Although specific individuals can be pointed to by each institution as a "success story", or groups have commended specific programs on occasion, there is no apparent comprehensive approach to quality determination at the present time.

(2) Although the enrollment estimates indicate that there will be substantial growth in the public sector of higher education in the region, there is a problem in the distribution of the growth - particularly with regard to full-time students and race. For example, Morgan State College and Coppin State College have been losing full-time students, while Towson State College and the University of Maryland Baltimore County have been increasing full-time students. Likewise, the Community College of Baltimore has lost full-time enrollment while the Baltimore County Community Colleges have increased. Morgan, Coppin and the Community College of Baltimore need to attract additional full-time white students, and Towson, UMBC and the County Community Colleges must continue to attract full-time black students.

(3) The University of Baltimore is entering the public system as an upper division and graduate institution, thereby competing for students and public resources with the existing public institutions.

(4) There is very little uniqueness in either the stated missions or the program offerings of any of the institutions. The program listing in the Appendix shows the degree of overlap existing in the institutions in the region. For example, five four year colleges in the area offer Bachelor's Degrees in Business Management and Administration; eight offer Bachelor's Degrees in Elementary Education; six offer Bachelor's Degrees in Dramatic Arts, and virtually every four year college in the area offer Bachelor's Degrees in the Liberal Arts such as Chemistry, Mathematics,

English, History, Philosophy, etc. In many of these institutions the total number of students enrolled in these programs is low.

(5) While the introduction of additional Doctoral degree programs might be justified if the Baltimore region were considered in isolation (Baltimore is among the largest Metropolitan Areas in the Nation), the existence of a large comprehensive public University at College Park economically precludes development of programs that are of a duplicative nature to serve the area exclusively. The problem is that while additional Doctoral degree offerings are difficult to justify, there is a need for research and public service activities in urban problems which are typically among the functions of a public University.

COMMITTEE CONSIDERATIONS

A report of this nature dealing with many institutions and the complexity of issues surrounding each would be unnecessarily long if all of the Committee's deliberations were included. The Committee, however, feels that many of the considerations that it explored are worthy of mention to provide background and additional rationale for the various recommendations which are presented to the Council.

Quality

Of over-riding importance to all of the Committee's deliberations, was the question of quality. What is quality, how is it measured, how can it be enhanced -- were questions the Committee attempted to address. The Committee's emphasis on quality was based on two fundamental premises: one, that high quality programs are essential to the future of higher education; and two, in times of leveling enrollment and shortages of funds, judgments concerning the activities of institutions will have to be based on criteria other than the

increased numbers of students that an institution is able to attract. Each of the presidents interviewed agreed that quality should be of paramount importance to higher education, all felt they were doing a quality job even though they were uncertain as to how to measure quality and all agreed that increased funding would enhance quality.

The Committee is not satisfied with the present assessment of the quality of the institutions. The Committee could not find a yardstick to determine whether the institutions are doing the best job possible, nor was it convinced that a systematic assessment of quality is contemplated. A major recommendation, therefore, deals with developing an assessment mechanism for quality for purposes of providing for quality enhancement.

Funding

The Committee believes that the level of State funding provided to the four year public institutions in the Metropolitan Baltimore area is in need of serious review. In recent years, for example, the State Colleges have had to increase student tuition and fees substantially in order to maintain operations. Morgan State College now has an annual charge to students of $701 which is the highest in the State for a public institution. Student charges of this magnitude may be prohibitive to the citizens of the area, thereby, substantially limiting student accessibility to higher education.

The Committee's concern with developing high quality offerings in all of the institutions will require additional funds to increase faculty salaries, and to provide for increased operating expenditures. Additional student charges to provide for these increases should be kept to a minimum to avoid further potential inaccessibility to students. Therefore, additional State funds must be

provided to these institutions in the future.

Another problem, primarily with the State Colleges, is the college's lack of flexibility in spending in budgeted categories. The Committee strongly endorses the Council's recommendation which will allow the State Colleges to expend appropriated funds in activities (other than salaries and wages) as they deem appropriate to carry out the operation of the institution.

Several of the Committee recommendations require that the Council for Higher Education perform functions which it does not now perform. The Committee wishes to point out that additional staffing and support will be required for the Council to accomplish these functions. However, the benefits to the State should be more than worth the additional cost.

State University of Metropolitan Baltimore

A major area of consideration was the question of the creation of a State University of the Metropolitan Baltimore Area, often referred to as SUMBA. Given the lack of uniqueness of the institutions studied in regard to institutional mission, programs offered, population served, and the close proximity of each institution to the other, the Committee explored at great length whether the delivery of higher education might be more efficiently and economically accomplished if SUMBA were created. Such a concept had many apparent advantages. Coordination of the activities of the institutions would not be a problem since all campuses would report to a single central administration; wide spread unnecessary duplication of program offerings would be eliminated by having each campus specialize in unique fields of knowledge; desegregation of the institutions would be enhanced because students would have to select campuses on the basis of programs rather than race; quality of the offerings could be improved by bringing faculty in one discipline together on one campus combining their expertise.

If the assignment of the Committee were to design a higher education system from "scratch" with no institutions presently existing to service the area, the SUMBA approach would be very appealing; the concept of SUMBA is not without problems, but it is appealing. The reality of the situation, however, is that there are existing institutions each with a faculty, facilities, programs, and a constituency that looks to it for provision of a broad range of offerings. To have the mass movement of students and faculty from campus to campus which program centralization would require is, in the opinion of the Committee, neither feasible nor desirable. The new structure would not deal with the provision of general education for the large number of undergraduate students who are unclassified with respect to program - that is the 30% of the present undergraduate students who are undecided about a definite program choice. The new structure would not provide for the cross fertilization of ideas among students and faculty involved in different disciplines. The new structure would not be equipped to deal with the future possibility of a student designing his own inter-disciplinary major by selecting from a variety of different departmental offerings unless a mass transit system among the campuses was provided. It was apparent to the Committee that while the present system is by no means perfect, the proposed new structure would create a new set of problems of unknown dimension that may not possess the flexibility to deal with the higher education needs of the citizens in the future.

A recognition of the disadvantages of the SUMBA structure, however, does not address the problems which the committee identified: Quality assessment, enrollment distribution, a new institution entering the public sector and the needs to be served in the area. Could these problems be dealt with effectively within the framework of the existing structure? The Committee felt they could and

the recommendations taken together regarding statements of mission, prioritizing activities, elimination of further program duplication, quality, enrollment ceilings, and a status change for Morgan represent, in the Committee's opinion, a positive future direction for public higher education in the area which can operate effectively and efficiently.

Community Colleges

As important as the SUMBA considerations were to the Committee's deliberations concerning the four year colleges, equally important was its exploration of the possibility of combining the four community colleges into one regional community college under one administrative head and one board. Abundant evidence of program duplication among the county community colleges and the Community College of Baltimore exists and the racial composition of the Community College of Baltimore and the county community colleges is widely disparate.

The Committee heard from each of the community college presidents and explored the concept of a single regional community college with them at great length. It was pointed out that in many large metropolitan areas the regional concept was effectively operating at the present time. However, there was limited support among the presidents for the concept. The Committee reached the consensus that cooperation and unity of the four institutions could be enhanced without structural change. The Committee's recommendations concerning regionalized programs among the four institutions, and elimination of further program duplication are intended to accomplish the goals relating to community colleges without changing the structure.

It should be noted that the Committee does feel the question of regionalizing the community colleges in the area needs to be explored in greater depth and recommends that the Rosenberg Commission examine the merits of a regional structure for community colleges which serve population centers rather than political subdivisions.

Morgan State College

The Committee gave extensive consideration to the problem of how best to provide the citizens of the Baltimore Region with access to Doctoral programs, and how to provide needed research and public service programs in the area without creating programs which would unnecessarily duplicate those which are presently offered the University of Maryland at College Park. A university is generally defined as an institution which offers undergraduate and graduate instruction, research and public service activities. Consistent with this definition, a university's activities can range from comprehensive in scope with Doctoral Degrees in a wide variety of disciplines to limited in scope providing programs in very specific and specialized areas.

The aspirations on the part of Morgan State College to achieve University status grew out of the recognition on the part of the College of the need for an urban oriented university serving the needs of Baltimore. The Baltimore area does indeed provide a large urban laboratory which is unique in the State, and which needs assistance in solving its problems and providing for its future. Morgan State College has numerous past accomplishments and is recognized by the black community, as well as by others, as an outstanding institution with a long history of service to black students during the time when they were not admitted to the majority of Maryland institutions of higher education.

The Committee was aware of the recommendations from the Cox Task Force to develop Morgan as a university. Consultants were brought in from other states to meet with the administration and faculty of Morgan State College to determine

the goals, objectives, existing resources, and additional resource requirements for possible university status for Morgan State. The consultants were:

Dr. Allan Tucker
Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
Florida State University System

Dr. William Smith
Director of Higher Education Planning (Recently Retired)
New York State Board of Regents

Dr. Herman Branson
President
Lincoln University (Pennsylvania)

The Committee feels that the Institute for Political Education, the Urban Affairs Institute, and the involvement of the faculty in the business operations of many Baltimore firms are the seeds of the research and public service components of a University rather than a college. In recognition of these emerging roles, the Committee recommends that Morgan State College become Morgan State University. It should be clearly understood that this recommendation envisions for the foreseeable future development of a single Doctoral program in urban oriented studies rather than a duplication of the comprehensive University model of College Park. It does, however, provide a new thrust for Morgan State compatible with its location and the needs of Baltimore City.

Governing Boards

It would have been difficult for the Committee to have examined the SUMBA concept, regionalized colleges, university status for institutions, etc., without touching upon broad structural concerns. The Committee heard time and again how institutional action and responsiveness are hindered by the various levels of procedural red tape that they must wade through. The Committee believes that additional flexibility for the institutions to spend money within budgeted categories is essential to creating accountability, responsibility and vitality within the institutions, particularly the State Colleges. The Committee also was

made aware of the difficulties that institutions face in dealing with a single board responsible for many institutions. As a result, two recommendations, one which provides for separate boards for each institution and the other which provides for a strong coordinating board, are directed by the Committee to the Rosenberg Commission for consideration.

The Committee feels that individual governing boards would have the time, in dealing with a single institution, to:

(a) Evaluate the desires and capabilities of the administration and faculty of the institution and set realistic goals.

(b) Monitor and improve the quality of the institution's program.

(c) Establish priorities for budgetary support.

(d) Evaluate performance audits of the institution with the objective of providing accountability to the State.

(e) Be more sensitive to community needs.

A governing board with responsibility for a number of institutions must of necessity deal with broad issues on the one hand, or approval of trivial detail on the other which do not accomplish the above activities. The Committee recognizes, however, that in some cases it may be desirable because of geography, program similarity, or other factors to have a single governing board responsible for more than one campus. While the Committee did not study Salisbury State College and the University of Maryland - Eastern Shore, this may be such an example.

Creation of many governing boards, however, makes necessary the creation of a strong coordinating authority dealing with long and short range plans, program duplication, effectiveness, manpower requirements, budget and facility coordination, and other activities necessary to assure the most economic and efficient utilization of the State's higher education resources.

The Committee examined the situation in several other states. It found that in the Virginia system, for example, each insitution has its own governing board and the State has established a strong central coordinating agency for higher education. In Virginia, institutions such as the University of Virginia, V.P.I., William and Mary, and V.M.I. have prospered, and are recognized nationally.

Other Considerations

In addition to the major considerations and recommendations of the Committee which are given the highest priority, there are a number of other matters which came to the Committee's attention. Each was explored to determine whether offering recommendations concerning them would help facilitate the solution of the major problems identified by the Committee.

Developing a common catalog, permitting students to take courses on any and all campuses, increasing other-race grants to Morgan and Coppin, lifting the 15% out-of-state student enrollment from Morgan, and the question of counseling were all recommendations which developed from these considerations.

The development of a common catalog for institutions in the Baltimore-Metropolitan Region, not by course and time, but by program with statements of clear institutional goals is seen as a way to increase student access to higher education. This may also reduce the need for duplication of offerings. The development of this catalog should be a Council function with the Council having the responsibility for its content and format.

The Committee also believes that students at the four year colleges in the area should have the right to take undergraduate courses, on a space available basis, at an institution other than the one in which he or she is matriculated. The Committee believes that such courses should be approved by the students "home" institution. But once this is done the credits taken and grades achieved

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

should have full transferability.

Both Morgan and Coppin expressed the need for additional other-race grants to permit them to reach out and attract white students to their campuses. Each said they had used all of their funds and could have attracted substantial numbers of additional white students had more funds been available. The Committee concluded that if these institutions are to attract other-race students as specified in the State's Desegregation Plan they should have sufficient funds to attract students. It should be noted that this 10% recommended increase in funding should be reviewed on a yearly basis to determine its effect in attracting white students to those campuses. (Note: In Fiscal 1974 other-race grants money received by the institutions were as follows: Coppin $59,220; Morgan $76,000; Towson $91,300).

Also, of concern to the Committee, was the fact that Morgan, while unable to reach its projected enrollment level for several years, had been turning away qualified out-of-state students because of a 15% enrollment ceiling placed on them by the Board of Trustees. Morgan turned away 3 out of 4 qualified out-of-state students because of the ceiling although they had the space and faculty to accept more. The Committee feels that it is desirable for Morgan to attract these students, and so recommends. The Committee notes the recent action of the Board of Trustees in lifting this ceiling, but feels that its recommendation should remain in the report in order to emphasize the importance of lifting the ceiling.

The Committee recognizes that while its charge was to review higher education in the Baltimore-Metropolitan Area and offer recommendations concerning the activities of the institutions in the region, many of the recommendations which follow have broader application then to just those institutions in the region. The Committee, believes its recommendations regarding quality, statement of mission, prioritizing activities, regional colleges, and separate governing boards

for institutions are recommendations which should have application across all of the public institutions of higher education in Maryland.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1 -

Throughout its study of higher education in the Baltimore Metropolitan region, the Committee kept in mind that quality is the primary goal laid down in the Master Plan for Higher Education in Maryland, adopted in 1968 by the Maryland Council for Higher Education. As is stated in the Master Plan for Higher Education in Maryland in 1968: "Quality education implies, first of all, excellence no matter what standard is applied. Hence, any planning that is done should aim to develop institutions to the point where they compare favorably with those recognized as the best of their kind, whether they be universities, state colleges or community colleges."

The Committee's convictions on this score are underlined by the Final Report of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. In the last two decades or so, it said, the emphasis in higher education was on quantity but in the years ahead, "Attention can now turn and should turn to the quality of the effort". It added significantly: "'Elite' institutions of all types--colleges and universities should be protected and encouraged as a source of scholarship and leadership training at the highest levels. They should not be homogenized in the name of egalitarianism. Such institutions, whether public or private, should be given special support for instruction and research, and for the ablest of graduate students; they should be protected by policies or differentiation of functions."

The Committee is convinced that a strong reaffirmation must now be made of Maryland's commitment to high-quality education. And it agrees with others that the time is particularly ripe for this emphasis: (1) enrollment growth is tapering off, lessening the need for major expansion of personnel and facilities;

(2) the growing differential between out-of-state and in-state tuition charges may begin to stop the substantial outflow of Maryland students to non-Maryland colleges and universities; and (3) the growing diversity of student bodies by race and socioeconomic status necessitates major changes in the character of instruction to assure that students with varying talents are enabled to make their contribution at the very top of their chosen professions or vocation.

The last of these three points requires brief elaboration. "Quality" has unfortunately acquired a negative connotation of exclusiveness. The Committee rejects this meaning, endorsing instead the viewpoint of William W. Turnbull, a former president of the Educational Testing Service: "The basis for (the negative connotation) may rest to a large extent in our historical view of quality as one-dimensional. We need to see other dimensions, which can be fostered within any institution. And we need to strive for a recognition, outside the academic community as well as inside, of the reality and increasing critical nature of those dimensions."

In the last decade or so, the State has greatly expanded opportunities for access to postsecondary education. While there are some overlaps in the tripartite system, there are differentiated functions which each of three segments of public higher education serves. In the course of the work of the Committee it became apparent that the people of this State are hesitant to speak openly about the need for high-quality education for those students of demonstrated potential who aspire to positions of corporate, professional, and public leadership.

One of the challenges confronting higher education is how to assess or measure accurately its success or failure. Institutions, particularly older private universities, such as Harvard and Stanford, are often judged by their reputation for scholarship and selectivity among students. Undoubtedly, these

indicators have relevance to the quality of instruction, undergraduate as well as graduate. But they are surely not wholly adequate measures. Some institutions put so much emphasis upon scholarship and graduate education that nearly the full burden of undergraduate teaching falls upon instructional assistants and junior faculty members. Furthermore, some institutions are so selective that it can be argued that their students could succeed no matter where they went. Thus something more needs to be added to an assessment of quality.

The main piece of evidence as to quality, though hard to develop, is the "value added" to the students; that is, the increment to their self-instructional knowledge and skills that is attributable to their participation in the educational process. The larger the increment, the higher the quality of education. One partial measure of value added by a particular institution of higher education is a comparison of its students with others, standardized for prior achievement (e.g., equal SAT scores upon matriculation), in performance on examinations such as GRE, LSAT, MEDCAT. Another partial measure is a comparison of the particular institution's students with others of <u>like ability</u> in post-baccalaureate activities; for instance, comparison of the number of its and others' students who were admitted to the most selective graduate and professional schools or who won national competitive awards, etc.

It should be noted from the outset that the committee does not perceive quality as only enrolling students who are from the upper 5% of their high school graduating class, but instead, view quality as developing a stated mission and accomplishing that mission at the highest level possible. If the mission is to educate students in the art of carpentry, then a quality job is accomplished if that student becomes a very good, competent carpenter. This notion of quality leads to a possible measure of quality, how well someone uses the skills they have sought. We could examine the performance of graduates of institutions and

judge institutional quality on that basis.

Although questions pertaining to what quality is and how one measures it were difficult for the Committee to answer, the recommendations which follow represent the initial and minimal attempt by the Council to approach the questions above. The Committee is firm in its conviction that the emphasis on higher education in Maryland in the future must be quality.

A. THE MARYLAND COUNCIL FOR HIGHER EDUCATION BE GIVEN THE ACCREDITATION FUNCTION OF THE POSTSECONDARY INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION.

The Committee feels that it is essential that the agency charged by law with the responsibility for the coordination of higher education be also assigned the accreditation function. The Committee believes that without the powers inherent in the accreditation function that the assessment of quality would be difficult, if not impossible. The Committee sees the emphasis of the accreditation function under Council direction shifting from one of minimal standards to one of quality assessment. The purpose will be to identify quality at all levels so that it can be enhanced and to support its development where it presently does not exist. It should be noted that the State Department of Education, which presently performs the State's accreditation function, has recommended that this function be transferred to the Council.

B. BEGINNING WITH THE 1975-1976 ACADEMIC YEAR, THE COUNCIL BRING INTO THE STATE PERSONS OF RECOGNIZED COMPETENCE IN VARIOUS FIELDS OF KNOWLEDGE IN ORDER TO ASSESS QUALITY OF THE OFFERINGS IN THOSE FIELDS OF KNOWLEDGE AT THE PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION. A RE-ASSESSMENT OF THE VARIOUS FIELDS OF KNOWLEDGE SHOULD BE COMPLETED ON A FOUR YEAR CYCLE.

The Committee wishes to stress that this recommendation is not a "witch hunt" but instead a systematic assessment of the State's progress in developing quality higher education. This activity will permit regular examination by experts in order to measure progress achieved between the periods of evaluation. The Committee expects that these assessments will require resources in the range of $100,000 per year.

C. THE MARYLAND COUNCIL FOR HIGHER EDUCATION DEVELOP AND CONDUCT, ON AN ANNUAL BASIS, A FOLLOW-UP STUDY OF THE GRADUATES OF THE PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE STATE.

Since one of the measures of quality agreed upon by those who have been concerned with its measure is an assessment of the accomplishment of the graduates of institutions, the Committee feels that this recommendation is important to quality assessments. Where students go upon completion of their education and what they do are essential questions to answer in order to determine if a quality job is being done in preparing individuals for the rest of their productive lives.

Recommendation 2 -

ALL INSTITUTIONS BE REQUIRED TO SUBMIT TO THE MARYLAND COUNCIL FOR HIGHER EDUCATION A CLEAR STATEMENT OF THE MISSION OF THE INSTITUTION.

The Committee found that it was difficult, with a few exceptions, to determine from either the written or verbal presentations of the presidents the missions of the colleges. Since program offerings (See Appendix) are

similar from institution to institution it was impossible for the Committee and/or its staff to determine on its own the possible missions of the various institutions.

The Committee believes that it is essential for each institution to develop a clear statement of mission.

Minimumly, these statements of mission must include the following items:

1. The goals and objectives of the institution; not generalized but specific statements.
2. The characteristics of the student population that the institution wishes to attract.
3. The types of programs and degree offerings that the institution feels are related to their mission.
4. The resources required by the institution in order to accomplish the mission.

As a result of these mission statements, it will be possible to determine how each institution in the region can make unique contributions to the provision of higher education in the Metropolitan Area. Each institution should develop these statements in time to be submitted with the Executive Master Plan update due May 1975.

Recommendation 3 -

EACH INSTITUTION SHOULD SUBMIT TO THE MARYLAND COUNCIL FOR HIGHER EDUCATION A PRIORITIZED LISTING OF THE CURRENT AND FUTURE ACTIVITIES OF THE INSTITUTION.

The Committee believes that such a prioritized listing of institutional activities is essential to providing higher education in an efficient and economic manner. With the limited resources available to the State, the Committee recognizes that all activities of every institution cannot be funded at a level which will ensure the highest level of quality for that activity. If institutions are to be funded at a level which will enable them to conduct activities at a high quality level, it is essential that priorities be established by each institution.

The Committee suggests that activities be grouped in categories such as essential to the mission, desirable to achieve the mission, desirable, but peripheral to the mission, etc. Available monies should be distributed to activities in accordance with the established priorities. An initial statement of priorities is due by May 1975.

Recommendation 4 -

NO NEW ACADEMIC PROGRAM DUPLICATION BE PERMITTED AMONG THE INSTITUTIONS IN THE REGION.

The Committee found that some 200 different program offerings with more than 10,000 course sections are available to students in the region at the various institutions. The majority of these programs are available on more than one campus. The Committee was unable to ascertain the degree to which the existing academic program duplication is necessary or unnecessary. The Committee believes, however, that the close proximity of these institutions should preclude any further program duplication in the region. Further duplication would be a waste

of resources, obscure institutional missions, and encourage institutional choice by students on the basis of race or factors other than program. With the designation of regional programs at the community colleges, the development of a common catalog, and making possible cross registration at the four year public institutions, the Committee firmly believes that there is no need for further program duplication at these institutions.

Recommendation 5 -

FULL-TIME ENROLLMENT CEILINGS BE IMPOSED ON THE FOUR YEAR PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS IN THE REGION.

The Committee found that the four year public institutions attract the majority of their students from the Baltimore geographic area. Overall, 83% of the undergraduate students come from the Baltimore-Metropolitan region. Since these institutions draw from the same region, the Committee believes that increased expansion at one institution in the region will be at the expense of another. As the number of available students levels off in the future and the competition for students increases, some institutions in the region are likely to lose students. Also, there is competition for many of these same students by the private colleges in the region. The Committee feels that in order to provide for maximum use of the educational resources in the area in the future, that full-time enrollment ceilings must be placed on the public four year institutions.

Implementation of the recommendation will accomplish several desirable outcomes:

1. One institution will not grow at the expense of another in the area.
2. Maximum use will be made of existing facilities and those facilities presently in process of design or construction.
3. The desegregation process will be enhanced by allowing for planned growth in full-time student population.

4. Each institution can concentrate on developing quality programs to serve their constituency.

In making a determination of the actual number of full-time students which will serve as the ceiling for each institution, the Committee examined in detail the long range projections of full-time students, and the existing and planned facilities in each institution. The Committee based its capacity estimate on 100 to 110 net assignable square feet per student which is higher than the average for similar institutions nationally, but which is the opinion of recognized academic space experts is an acceptable planning figure. The use of full-time students places the planning on a "real" basis rather than an abstract basis which is the result of using day equivalent students. While the Committee recognizes the difference, it does not believe that it is significant for the purposes of providing space for full-time students since part-time students may be schedule in the evening or other low utilization times.

The peak projected number of full-time students (graduate and undergraduate) for the foreseeable future for the public four year colleges in the Baltimore Region is 24,500 by 1985. The recommended full-time student ceiling for each institution is as follows (present full-time students are given for comparative purposes):

	Full-Time Recommended Ceiling	Full-Time Present
University of Maryland - Baltimore County	6,000	4,900
Coppin State	3,000	1,992
Morgan State	5,500	4,023
Towson State	8,000	7,855
University of Baltimore	2,000	2,403
Total	24,500	21,173

The implications for these estimated full-time students for facilities is examined below in detail for each institution. In general, the proposed additions in conjunction with the existing space and space under construction or design in each institution will accommodate the number of full-time students when the ceiling is reached. There are two exceptions to this matching; one, the University of Maryland Baltimore County with a ceiling of 6,000 full-time students will not have need for the $22,000,000 of proposed additions, thereby providing a substantial savings to the State; and two, Towson State will have space to accommodate approximately 1,000 more students than the ceiling of 8,000 full-time students. When the space presently under construction and design at the University of Maryland - Baltimore County is completed, the institution will have 694,000 N.A.S.F. Applying the criteria of between 100 to 110 N.A.S.F. per student means they will have capacity for between 6300 and 6900 full-time students. The need for additional space is unnecessary if the ceiling on full-time students is 6000. If the University of Maryland - Baltimore County were to expand beyond 6000 full-time students there would be fewer full-time students available to the other institutions in the area resulting in some of them having excess space.

The excess capacity at Towson State occurs because the building program has already progressed to a point which precludes stopping it, and the proposed additions are to provide minor renovations and a needed addition to a maintenance building. This additional capacity at Towson State, however, will provide the flexibility necessary in the event that more full-time students actually materialize in the future than are estimated at this time.

The following breakdown shows the picture for each of the public four year institutions:

1. UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND - BALTIMORE COUNTY	NASF	COST
Existing Net Assignable Square Feet (NASF)	481,739	
NASF Under Construction	115,640	$7,663,100
NASF Under Design	97,050	9,774,500
Total NASF	694,429	17,437,600
Proposed Addition (NASF)	284,128	22,106,500
Grand Total (NASF)	978,557	

The total NASF of 694,429 existing, under construction and design can accommodate the 6,000 full-time students. Therefore, the proposed additional of 284,128 NASF costing approximately 22 million dollars should be eliminated.

2. COPPIN STATE COLLEGE		
Existing Net Assignable Square Feet (NASF)	157,070	
NASF Under Construction	43,000	$4,772,000
NASF Under Design	98,608	11,481,727
Total NASF	298,678	16,253,727
Proposed Addition (NASF)	42,795	5,230,000
Grand Total (NASF)	341,473	

The planned space will accommodate the 3,000 full-time students.

3. MORGAN STATE COLLEGE		
Existing Net Assignable Square Feet (NASF)	551,639	
NASF Under Construction	None	
NASF Under Design	31,450	$12,052,632
Total NASF	583,089	12,052,632
Grand Total (NASF)	591,738	

The planned space will accommodate the 5,500 full-time students.

4. TOWSON STATE COLLEGE		
Existing Net Assignable Square Feet (NASF)	757,698	
NASF Under Construction	213,600	$16,321,802
NASF Under Design	91,000	8,194,747
Total NASF	980,698	24,516,549
Proposed Additions (NASF)	71,965	562,000
Grand Total (NASF)	1,052,663	

The planned space will accommodate in excess of 9,000 full-time students. However, the 8,000 full-time ceiling should be adhered to, with the excess space providing a hinge against unanticipated enrollment increases in full-time students.

5. UNIVERSITY OF BALTIMORE

Existing Net Assignable Square Feet (NASF)	180,824	
NASF Under Construction	None	
NASF Under Design	62,493	$ 7,241,500
Total NASF	243,317	7,241,500
Proposed Additions (NASF)	None	
Grand Total (NASF)	243,317	

The planned space will accommodate the 2,000 full-time upper level and graduate students.

It should be noted that the Council will review these enrollment ceilings annually in conjunction with the Council's annual revised enrollment forecasts to determine if adjustments in the ceilings are necessary.

Recommendation 6 -

The following recommendations apply specifically to Morgan State College.

A. MORGAN STATE COLLEGE BE DEVELOPED INTO A STATE UNIVERSITY.

The Baltimore Area has need for an institution which can give a focus to the study and solution of urban problems. The Committee believes that the location and resources of Morgan State uniquely qualify it to fill this role. Activities such as those presently provided by the Institute for Political Education, and the Urban Affairs Institute which provide research and public service in urban areas are the basis for recognition of Morgan State as a University. Existing programs should be reviewed in light of this new thrust and budgetary needs and priorities should be determined consistent with Morgan's new role.

B. ACADEMIC CURRICULA OFFERED BY MORGAN STATE SHOULD REFLECT A MOST INTENSE CONCERN FOR UNDERSTANDING AND SOLVING URBAN PROBLEMS.

One of the missions of Morgan State as described in several documents prepared by Morgan State administrators and faculty indicate that the institution is seeking to "develop a strong urban and culturally diverse orientation toward providing the leaders and the technology for defining and solving urban problems as well as toward providing a balanced program of educational services for the local community". The Committee strongly encourages this role.

C. MORGAN STATE COLLEGE BE PERMITTED TO DEVELOP A SINGLE DOCTORAL PROGRAM IN URBAN STUDIES.

The Committee does not envision future development of Morgan State University as a comprehensive institution offering a range of Doctoral programs. Rather, the Committee is recommending that Morgan develop a single Doctoral program in Urban Studies with related areas of research and public service activities.

Recommendation 7 -

THE STATE PROVIDE ACCESS FOR QUALIFIED STUDENTS OF ALL RACES TO DOCTORAL DEGREE PROGRAMS AVAILABLE IN THE STATE.

The Committee examined at great length the question of whether more doctoral degree granting institutions are needed in Maryland. This question was explored from two points of view: the need for additional doctoral degree granting institutions and the high cost related to the initiation of such programs. The Committee was unable to document the need for the establishment of additional doctoral programs and found the costs associated with the operation of doctoral programs in general to be at least 4 times more expensive than undergraduate programs.

The Committee did hear testimony that the number of black students graduating from doctoral programs at the University of Maryland and the Hopkins is disproportionally low. The Committee believes that the solution to this problem rests in the access question rather than availability. With this in mind the Committee recommends:

A. THAT THE UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND STRENGTHEN ITS SPECIFIC PLANS WHICH WILL ENSURE THE INCREASED PRESENCE OF BLACK STUDENTS IN DOCTORAL PROGRAMS.

B. THAT THE STATE PROVIDE OTHER-RACE MONIES TO THE UNIVERSITY FOR THE PURPOSE OF ATTRACTING QUALIFIED BLACK STUDENTS TO COLLEGE PARK FOR DOCTORAL TRAINING.

C. WHILE THE COMMITTEE HAS NOT MADE A DETAILED STUDY OF THE PROGRAMS AT JOHNS HOPKINS, THE DEVELOPMENT OF A SIMILAR AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PLAN BY THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY BE ENCOURAGED FOR SUBMISSION TO THE COUNCIL FOR REVIEW AND THAT IF FOUND ACCEPTABLE, A STIPEND SYSTEM BE DEVELOPED BY THE STATE TO EASE THE TUITION BURDEN PLACED ON A STUDENT ATTENDING JOHNS HOPKINS FOR DOCTORAL PROGRAMS.

The Committee believes that the money saved by not creating additional Doctoral programs across the State will more than pay for the costs associated with the acceptance of items A and B above.

Recommendation 8 -

A. ACCESS BE PROVIDED TO DESIGNATED UNIQUE PROGRAMS IN COMMUNITY COLLEGES IN THE AREA BY CHARGING "IN COUNTY" TUITION TO ALL STUDENTS IN THE REGION.

B. THE COMMITTEE DOES FEEL THE QUESTION OF REGIONALIZING THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES IN THE AREA NEEDS TO BE EXPLORED IN GREATER DEPTH AND URGES THAT THE ROSENBERG COMMISSION EXAMINE THE MERITS OF A REGIONAL STRUCTURE FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGES WHICH SERVE POPULATION CENTERS RATHER THAN POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS.

Each of the four community colleges in the area should provide for students to attend designated unique programs at "in county" tuition charges regardless of whether the student's residence is Baltimore City or Baltimore County. This arrangement will allow for student access to a program without having the community colleges in each subdivision duplicate programs that exist in another college. A complete listing of the designated programs should be published annually for each of the community colleges and made available to the citizens in the region.

Recommendation 9 -

A COMMON CATALOG BE DEVELOPED BY THE COUNCIL FOR ALL THE INSTITUTIONS IN THE AREA AND BE DISSEMINATED TO STUDENTS AND THE PUBLIC.

Since many similar programs and dissimilar programs are offered by Towson, Morgan, Coppin, U.M.B.C. and the University of Baltimore, the Committee believes that there should be one single source which publicizes the availability of these programs. Each program description should include enough detail to allow persons to discern which program in which institution will best meet his educational needs.

Recommendation 10 -

STUDENTS BE PERMITTED TO TAKE UNDERGRADUATE COURSES WHICH RELATE TO THEIR PROGRAM AT ANY INSTITUTION IN THE REGION WHERE SPACE IS AVAILABLE.

The Committee believes that students should be able to take courses of study at any public institution in the region although the student is matriculated at another public insitution. The number of hours permitted should be determined by a Committee of the Academic Deans or Vice Presidents of the institutions with a report of the determination presented to the Council by May 1, 1975.

Recommendation 11 -

1. THE BOARD OF EACH OF THE PUBLIC COLLEGES IN MARYLAND EXAMINE WAYS IN WHICH THE COLLEGES CAN PROVIDE FRESHMEN ORIENTATION PROGRAMS WHICH INCLUDE COMPONENTS ON CHOOSING A COLLEGE MAJOR AND DEVELOPING LONG RANGE VOCATIONAL PLANS.
2. THE MARYLAND COUNCIL FOR HIGHER EDUCATION FORWARD A LETTER TO THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION RECOMMENDING THAT A COURSE FOR SECONDARY STUDENTS BE DESIGNED WHICH ASSISTS IN THE STUDENT'S DEVELOPMENT OF POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION PLANS FOR WORK OR COLLEGE, AND THAT ALL SECONDARY STUDENTS BE REQUIRED TO TAKE IT.

The Committee recognizes the fact that individual student contacts with guidance personnel in the secondary schools must be limited due to the large number of students per counselor. However, there appears to be a significant need to develop more clear vocational plans on the part of students, and particularly to make students more aware of the college and career options available to them. The Committee, therefore, feels that the above recommended two prong

approach will be a positive beginning to providing students in a formal way with the needed information on careers at both the secondary level and the college freshman level.

Recommendation 12 -

OTHER-RACE GRANT MONIES AT MORGAN STATE AND COPPIN STATE BE INCREASED BY 10%.

The Committee believes that both Coppin and Morgan could increase the other-race presence on their campuses if the necessary funds to attract full-time white undergraduate students to their campuses were available. Each year both institutions have utilized all of their other-race funds and found that additional white students could have been attracted to their campuses if more other-race money had been available.

Recommendation 13 -

THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF STATE COLLEGES LIFT FROM MORGAN ITS 15% LIMIT ON OUT-OF-STATE STUDENTS.

Because of Morgan State College's outstanding reputation as a nationally recognized institution of higher education, the Committee believes that they should be permitted to accept more qualified students from outside of Maryland. Morgan has indicated that they turn down 3 out of 4 qualified students from out-of-state because of the 15% enrollment ceiling and yet they have space and faculty available. The Committee believes that an institution of national reputation should serve the nation to the degree that Maryland students are not excluded by educational resource constraints.

Recommendation 14 -

A. THE GOVERNOR'S STUDY COMMISSION ON STRUCTURE AND GOVERNANCE OF EDUCATION FOR MARYLAND SHOULD CONSIDER THE NEED FOR A GOVERNING BOARD OF TRUSTEES DEVOTING ITS ATTENTION TO A SINGLE INSTITUTION WITH RESPECT TO INSTITUTIONAL OBJECTIVES, ROLE, MISSION, SCOPE, QUALITY, AND PRIORITIES: AND,

B. A STRONG CENTRAL COORDINATING AUTHORITY WITH POWERS TO SET ENROLLMENT CEILINGS, APPROVE PROGRAMS, ELIMINATE PROGRAMS, AVOID UNNECESSARY DUPLICATION AMONG INSTITUTIONS, ASSESS QUALITY PERFORMANCE, APPROVE LONG AND SHORT RANGE PLANS FOR PHYSICAL AND FISCAL RESOURCES, AND ESTABLISH OVERALL PRIORITIES FOR HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE STATE.

Maryland presently has 14 institutional governing boards, three segment boards and a Statewide Coordinating Agency for its higher education institutions. For the community college segment, there are three levels of boards: Institutional Governing Board, Segment Coordinating Board, and Statewide Higher Education Coordinating Agency. For the State Colleges, one State College has its own individual governing board, whereas the other six State Colleges have a segment governing board with no individual governing boards but with individual boards of visitors, the functions of which are unclear. The University as of 1970 changed from a main campus with branch campuses to a "University System with a Chancellor over each campus and with the president as coordinating officer" and does not have institutional governing boards or boards of visitors for any of its campuses.

There are a number of weaknesses in the present system. Governance requires a thorough knowledge and understanding of the requirements of the institution to carry out its assigned role and mission and a determination of policies to carry out its mission effectively and efficiently. Boards which have multiple institutions under their control are less likely to provide the kinds of leadership and support for the chief executive officer of an individual institution than those which can focus upon individual institutional needs. Individual governing boards can be more responsive to local needs. Segment boards tend to become engrossed in coordinating functions over the various institutions in their segment which has the effect of duplicating the coordinating efforts of the Statewide higher education agency and dilutes the attention that is given to individual institutions. The Committee feels, however, that in some instances it would be desirable to have a single board responsible for more than one campus, particularly because of geography, similarity of program, or other factors.

In effect, segment boards create an additional layer of coordination creating organizational problems and additional staffing which duplicate efforts at the Statewide level and do not contribute in the most effective way to a unified endeavor for the orderly growth and the development of higher education in the State.

The Committee believes that the Governor's Study Commission on Structure and Governance of Education for Maryland should consider the above stated two changes which seem desirable in the structure and governance of higher education.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE